

### **REMARKS**

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections contained in the Office Action of September 8, 2004 is respectfully requested.

In order to make necessary editorial corrections, the entire specification and abstract have been reviewed and revised. As the revisions are quite extensive, the amendments to the specification and abstract have been incorporated into the attached substitute specification and abstract. For the Examiner's benefit, a marked-up copy of the specification indicating the changes made thereto is also enclosed. No new matter has been added by the revisions. Entry of the substitute specification is thus respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected original claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner asserted that one of the phrases in original claim 6 lacked antecedent basis. In this regard, however, the Examiner is requested to note that original claims 1-13 have all been cancelled and replaced with new claims 14-32, including new independent claims 14 and 23. The new claims have been carefully drafted so as to fully comply with all of the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's formal rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 are not applicable to the new claims.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3 as being anticipated by the Feinbloom reference (USP 4,364,645); and rejected claims 4, 5 and 7-13 as being unpatentable over the Feinbloom reference. However, as indicated above, the original claims have now been cancelled and replaced with new claims 14-32. For the reasons discussed below, it is respectfully submitted that the new claims are clearly patentable over the prior art of record.

New independent claims 14 and 23 are directed to eyeglass frames and magnifying eyewear, respectively. Each of the new independent claims comprises a pair of main lens frames for supporting lenses to be mounted thereon, and a pair of *support frames*. *Each of the support frames is arranged inside a respective one of the main lens frames*, and has an engagement space for receiving a magnifying lens main unit.

As explained on page 12, lines 5-16 of the original specification, the arrangement described above provides several advantages. Firstly, because a support frame 4 is arranged inside a respective

main lens frame 3 as illustrated in Figures 1 and 2 of the present application, an eyeglass lens can be easily inserted within each of the main lens frames without requiring any special fabrication or insertion techniques. Furthermore, the magnifying lens main unit to be removably mounted in the engagement space of each support frame 4 can be easily replaced as necessary without disturbing the lens to be mounted within the main lens frame 3. Finally, prescription lenses can be inserted into the main lens frames so that a wearer can easily move back and forth between using the eyewear as normal corrective vision eyeglasses or as magnifying eyeglasses.

The Feinbloom reference discloses an adjustable frame for telescopic spectacles, including arcuate apertures 13, 14 formed within plastic carrier lenses 11, 12. As illustrated in Fig. 1, the plastic carrier lenses 11, 12 are arranged within a pair of main lens frames. However, the Feinbloom reference does not disclose or even suggest a pair of *support frames*, in which each of the support frames is *arranged inside a respective one of the main lens frames*. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the Feinbloom reference does not anticipate or even suggest the invention recited in new independent claims 14 and 23. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that new independent claims 14 and 23, and the claims that depend therefrom, are clearly patentable over the prior art of record.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner should have any comments or suggestions to help speed the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

Yoshio NAGATA

By: 

W. Douglas Hahm  
Registration No. 44,142  
Attorney for Applicant

WDH/abm  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
January 10, 2005